



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,961	08/22/2003	David M. Cooley	Cooley 2	8402
46900	7590	09/21/2009	EXAMINER	
MENDELSON, DRUCKER, & ASSOCIATES, P.C.			CHO, HONG SOL	
1500 JOHN F. KENNEDY BLVD., SUITE 405				
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2419	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/645,961	Applicant(s) COOLEY, DAVID M.
	Examiner Hong Cho	Art Unit 2419

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08e)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 5/26/2009. Claims 1-29 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1-3 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gebis et al (US 6993290), hereinafter referred to as Gebis, in view of Lund (US 20050140499).

Re claims 1 and 11, Gebis discloses wirelessly providing access to specialized content by a user over the Internet (column 1, line 1 to column 2, line 3). Gebis discloses a system comprising a portable personal radio (PPR) (*a user*, figure 1, element 12), a PPR server located between the Internet and the PPR (*wireless connection nodes in a*

geographically defined receiving area, figure 1, element 14; column 2, lines 28-30) and the wireless communication link between the two (wirelessly providing, over the Internet, access to specialized content by a user, providing one or more wireless connection nodes in a receiving area; delivering to said one or more connection nodes only content selected by an operator of said one or more wireless connection nodes, and transmitting said delivered content via said one or more connection nodes, column 2, lines 24-32).

Gebis fails to disclose delivering content selected by the operator independent of the user and independent of any preference of the user or the content available to the users is pre-specified based solely on the wireless connection node whose transmission the receiver receives, such that no determination of the user's current geographic location is required before the delivered content is transmitted. Lund discloses transmitting information without user request and determination of the user's current geographic location (paragraph [0024]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Gebis with the teaching of Lund for the benefit of providing automatic delivery of critical information to mobile users.

Re claims 2 and 12, Gebis discloses receiving content from the server (*receiving said transmitted delivered content with a receiver configured to receive content transmitted via said one or more wireless connection nodes, column 2, lines 3-7*).

Re claims 3 and 13, Gebis discloses receiving a single stream of content over the wireless link (*transmitting the delivered content over a single channel, column 2, lines 63-66*) and combining information from different sources by channel maxing

(subdividing the single channel so that plural content elements are provided on plural stations within the single channel, column 3, lines 39-45).

Claims 4-10 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gebis and Lund in view of Schmidt (US 4765753).

Re claims 4 and 14, Gebis discloses receiving a single stream of content pertaining to user's interest (*separately tuning to each of plural stations*, column 2, lines 1-4), but fails to transmit a unique spreading code for each of plural stations, receive the unique spreading codes, select one of plural stations to play to play the delivered content by using unique spreading codes associated with the selected one of plural stations.

Schmidt discloses separating message channels with different sets of code words and receiving information necessary for accessing channels by using spread codes (column 2, lines 11-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Gebis to implement the feature of sending a unique spreading code for each station to allow different radio networks to share the radio spectrum.

Re claims 5-7 and 15-17, Gebis discloses getting traffic report of commute route (*delivering content that is local to the proximity of the connection nodes and particular content type*, column 2, lines 3-6).

Re claims 8 and 18, Gebis discloses receiving content that pertains only to the user's personal interests (*reception of only the delivered content*, column 2, lines 43-45).

Re claims 9 and 19, Gebis discloses a PPR client establishing communication with a PPR server (*sending an uplink signal from a receiver to one or more connection nodes to enable the user to communicate with the one or more wireless connection nodes*, column 2, lines 37-38).

Re claims 10 and 20, Gebis discloses a PPR server receiving a subscription from a PPR client and providing information only pertaining to the client (*configuring said wireless connection nodes to receive said uplink signal and, based upon said signal, perform a function desired to be performed by said user*, column 2, lines 51-57).

Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gebis in view of Lund and further in view of Uematsu et al (US 2003009242, “Uematsu”)

Re claims 21-26, Gebis discloses receiving transmitted delivered content at the first time and other transmitted delivered content at the second time, wherein the content available to the receiver (column 3, lines 44-50) but fails to explicitly disclose at each of the first and second times is pre-specified based on the wireless connection node whose transmission the receiver receives, wherein when the users located in geographically defined receiving area enter other geographically defined receiving area, the users receive other transmitted delivered content with the receiver. Uematsu discloses transmitting content to users based on gatekeeping apparatus (figure 1, element 4). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Gebis with the teaching of Uematsu for the benefit of providing secure content delivery.

Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uematsu in view of Schmidt.

Re claims 27-29, Uematsu discloses a wireless connection node (figure 1, element 3) receiving first media content originating from a first content source and second media content originating from a second content source (figure 1, two content servers, element 2), but fails to disclose the wireless connection node spreading the first content using a first spreading code and the second content using a second spreading code; and the wireless connection node broadcasting the first and second spreading codes and the spread first and second content, wherein a plurality of receivers configured (i) to receive the spread first and second content and the first and second spreading codes and (ii) to despread a selected one of the spread first and second content using a corresponding one of first and second spreading codes may play the selected one of the first and second content. Schmidt discloses separating message channels with different sets of code words and receiving information necessary for accessing channels by using spread codes (column 2, lines 11-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Uematsu to implement the feature of utilizing spreading codes for the benefit of providing efficient and reliable content delivery to a given user.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 5/26/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Gebis fails to disclose content being specific to the geographically defined receiving area. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gebis discloses delivering the traffic report of his/her commute route or the weather forecast of his/her areas (column 2, lines 5-6).

With regard to claims 4 and 14, the applicant further argues that the motivation to combine Gebis, Lund and Schmidt lacks merit. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Schmidt was relied on showing teaching on utilizing spread codes in content delivery since it is common in the art the use of spreading codes in providing subsequent delivery of the content with coded information.

With regard to arguments over claims 21-26 are moot since the claims are rejected in view of new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hong Cho whose telephone number is 571-272-3087. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri during 7 am to 4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pankaj Kumar can be reached on 571-272-3011. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hong Cho/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2419